

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during a personal interview with the undersigned Attorney for Applicants on April 1, 2003. The claim amendments and remarks herein substantially reflect those discussed at the interview, except as noted below. Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 13, 15 and 16 have been amended. Claims 17-46 have been added. Claims 1-13 and 15-46 are now pending.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the crystalline molecular sieve has a pure (non-intergrowth) LEV or CHA structure. This recitation is supported at page 2, line 30 to page 3, line 1, and in the examples at page 8, line 10 and page 9, line 1. Claims 13 and 16 have been amended to recite that the molecular sieve is calcined. This recitation is supported at page 5, lines 20-23. Claim 15 has been amended to recite that the molecular sieve is pure. This recitation is supported in the examples at page 8, line 10 and page 9, line 1. Claim 16 has been amended to recite a description of particle size. This recitation is supported at page 3, lines 10-14.

New claims 17-46 have been added. New claims 17-25, 32-33, and 40-46 are supported at page 3, lines 3-13. New claim 26 corresponds to original claim 1, with a particle size limitation supported at page 3, lines 3-13. Claims 27-31 and 35-39 are supported by claims 4-8 as filed. Claim 34 recites that the source of silica is dissolved by heating, and is supported at page 3, line 25, page 7, line 33 and page 8, lines 25-26.

Thus, the claim amendments and new claims add no new matter. For the reasons following, Applicants believe all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 00/06493, for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. As agreed at the Interview, and reflected in paragraph 1 of the PTO-413

continuation sheet, Applicants have amended these claims to recite that the molecular sieve is calcined, which is not taught or suggested in the reference. Thus, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-13, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 98/15496, for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the molecular sieve is a pure (non-intergrowth) LEV or CHA structure, and claim 15 has been amended to recite that the molecular sieve is pure SAPO-34. Claim 16 has been amended to recite a particular particle size distribution. As the reference does not teach or suggest these limitations, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

New independent claim 26 recites the particle size distribution as discussed at the Interview (see paragraph 4 of the PTO-413 continuation sheet).

New independent claim 34 recites that the silicon source is dissolved by heating, which is not taught or suggested by WO 98/15496.


Thus, Applicants submit that these new independent claims, and the claims dependent therefrom, are also in condition for allowance.

Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney if there are any issues outstanding which have not been presented to the Examiner's satisfaction.

Respectfully submitted,

May 5, 2003

Date



Stephen D. Prodnuk
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 43,020

ExxonMobil Chemical Co.
Law Technology
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149
Phone: 281-834-2671
Fax: 281-834-2495